SUBJECTS.

Dewan's reply.—There are two questions, *viz.*, reducing the number of instalments and changing the kist months. In the case of garden lands, the number of instalments was at one time 10. It has been reduced to 4. In regard to rice lands, the number has been reduced from 6 to 4. I do not think that we shall be justified in going back to the old system of 10 kists. I think four kists are quite convenient to the ryots.

In regard to the months, however, I have been looking into the matter. Probably the months of Kanni and Thulam are a little premature. In the case of the Kanni crop, the demand comes just when the ryot is getting his outturn and he has to sell his produce at low rates. So, the question of putting off the instalments a month later will be considered.

5. *Changes in the rules re. puduval registry.*

Mr. C. Krishna Iyer (Member, Nedumangad Taluk) said that para 6 of the Forest Rules of 1079 conflicted with the provisions of the Land Conservancy or Poramboke Regulation, in that the former required that puduval lands should not be entered upon by parties till registered in their names, while the Poramboke Regulation permitted parties to enter upon the lands after three months from the date of application for registry. The Forest officers charged men for entry made under Regulation II of 1067, though Regulation II of 1068 did not allow that. In regard to applications for puduvals, the Rules required registry to first applicant, but there was no provision to ascertain who was the first applicant. This gave rise to disputes between the reclaimer of a puduval and the first applicant. He therefore requested that either the Revenue department should be ordered to do the work of recovering the value of trees on puduvals near the forest areas, or the Forest department, the work of registering puduvals; and that applications for puduvals should be notified in the Gazette.

Dewan's reply.—The Forest Rules and the Poramboke Regulation have been looked into and there is really no conflict between the two. In regard to the disposal of puduval cases, however, there can be no doubt that there is considerable delay. I believe that much of the difficulty the member has complained of is due to the delay in getting these cases disposed of. This will be looked into.

6. *Separate water-cess not to be levied on lands served by the Kodayar.*

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (Member, Kalkulam Taluk) rose to speak on the subject of water-cess when the Dewan made the following pronouncement. He thereupon said that he did not want to press Government for an answer.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Dewan's reply.—A special officer is now investigating the whole question. Till his investigation is completed and his report is received and considered by Government, it will not be possible to make any announcement on the subject of the water-rate to be levied on the lands benefited by the Kodayar Project. In view, however, to the apprehensions that are probably entertained by the holders of lands under the Kodayar, I have no hesitation in conveying to them the assurance of Government that the matter will be dealt with as sympathetically as possible. Before passing final orders on any scheme submitted, I shall visit the area concerned and hear what the people concerned have to say.

7. *Demand notice fees.*

Mr. K. Sankara Pillai (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) said that demand notices were being issued if payment was not made within the 15th of the month in which it fell due and that the method of calculating demand notice fees with reference to the distances at which the ryots lived worked hardship. The tax might be one fanam and the fees might come to 5 or 6 fanams. He requested that summonses might be issued instead of notices.

Mr. K. Narayana Panicker (Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) in supporting the member, said that in civil courts a uniform fee was being levied for notices, and that a fixed rate might also be levied for demand notices irrespective of the distances the peons had to go to serve them.

Dewan's reply.—There are two requests made in regard to this subject. The first is that we should not issue demand notices when people would not pay the monies due by them to the Sirkar, but that we should give them some days of grace and afterwards send a summons. This suggestion cannot be accepted. If a ryot does not pay, it is the duty of the Sirkar to send him a demand notice.

In regard to demand notice fees, at present these fees are calculated ratably according to the distances from the Taluk cutcherry to the residences of the defaulters. The question whether a uniform scale of fees may not be prescribed for all distances will be considered.

8. *Assessment on puduvals.*

Mr. K. Geevarghese (Member, Quilon Taluk) referred to the hardship resulting from a recent order of Government prescribing an assessment of not less than 5 fanams per acre on puduval lands and requested that the assessment should be made with reference to the *tharams* as determined by the Settlement department.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly